



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"It is only fair to say that the machinery, however imperfect, devised by the First Hague Conference has nevertheless rendered inestimable services to the cause of arbitration by putting the stamp of approval of an international conference upon arbitration as a means of settling difficulties, and by turning the minds and the thoughts of nations in controversy to The Hague, where this temporary tribunal of a very special kind can be called into being for the settlement of their disputes which diplomacy has failed to adjust."

HENRY F. MUNRO.

Columbia University.

Breaches of Anglo-American Treaties. By MAJOR JOHN BIGELOW.
(New York: Sturgis and Walton Company. 1917. Pp. xi,
248, with three maps.)

A curious, interesting, and, in some ways, a futile book. Futile, because of the purpose avowed by the author in the preface: "The following study is devoted to determining the relative trustworthiness of two great nations as indicated in their conventional intercourse." He has succeeded in showing that because of divergent interpretations of treaty provisions, of changed conditions, of extreme exigencies, both Great Britain and the United States have acted at times in such a way as to incur the accusation of bad faith. He has indicated that Great Britain has violated at least eight treaties, and the United States four treaties. He has tabulated "the injurious acts done, one to the other, in violation of international law" and finds British violations, expressed in terms of indemnities awarded, as amounting to \$28,690,694, and American violations as amounting to \$5,505,328.34.

Major Bigelow's general conclusions are to the effect that Great Britain has been less trustworthy than the United States with respect to treaty engagements, and that British diplomacy has far excelled American diplomacy.

As regards trustworthiness, it would seem futile to indulge in invidious generalizations. A liberal, charitable conclusion concerning breaches of Anglo-American treaties would seem to be that honest differences of opinion may easily arise respecting treaty obligations; that all treaties are made subject to the implied condition of *rebus sic stantibus*; and that every nation is bound to safeguard its vital interests from unanticipated injuries.

As regards diplomacy, it is true that the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, from the American point of view, has generally been considered as a

decided triumph for Great Britain. But it should likewise be remembered that the treaty of Washington, from the British point of view, was a decided triumph for the United States. It virtually determined in advance the issue of the Geneva arbitration whereby England was compelled to pay the United States fifteen millions of dollars. In estimating diplomatic successes, it is more just to compare the results attained with the difficulties overcome than to judge the results by themselves. In this sense even the Clayton-Bulwer treaty need not be condemned as an absolute failure for American diplomacy.

The most instructive and entertaining portion of Major Bigelow's book is to be found in Chapters III, IV, and V, which deal with the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. He has included some interesting matter from the Clayton Papers in the Library of Congress throwing some new and disagreeable light on the personality of Sir Henry Bulwer. Evidence of duplicity on the latter's part towards his own government as well as towards Secretary Clayton is revealed, though little is adduced to alter the generally accepted estimate of the negotiations for the treaty bearing their names. It merely tends to confirm Blaine's judgment that the treaty had been "misunderstandingly entered into, imperfectly comprehended, contradictorily interpreted, and mutually vexatious."

For those who may not have familiarized themselves with the extraordinary rôle played by Great Britain as the "protector" of the Mosquito Indians and as the rival of the United States for the control of the interoceanic routes across Central America, Major Bigelow's brief study will be of interest and enjoyment. It would seem to reflect, however, the spirit of an enquiring mind, rather than the results of profound research.

PHILIP MARSHALL BROWN.

Princeton University.

The System of Financial Administration of Great Britain. By W. F. WILLOUGHBY, W. W. WILLOUGHBY AND SAMUEL McCUNE LINDSAY. Published for the Institute for Government Research. Introduction by A. Lawrence Lowell. (New York: D. Appleton and Company. 1917. Pp. xvi, 392.)

For nearly forty years England has been indebted to the early movement in the United States for civil service reform for the only detailed and comprehensive history of its civil service that it possesses. The